



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,529	09/10/2003	Cary James Miller	215105.01500	5356
27160	7590	06/13/2006	EXAMINER	
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 525 WEST MONROE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693			YU, MELANIE J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1641		

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/658,529	MILLER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Melanie Yu	1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-68 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claim 1-12 are drawn to an immunosensor system comprising a first and second immunosensor, classified in class 435, subclass 287.1.
- II. Claims 13-28 are drawn to a method for assaying a target analyte while reducing interference in an immunosensor system, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- III. Claims 29-34 are drawn to an immunoassay device comprising a conduit, classified in class 435, subclass 287.3.
- IV. Claims 35-40 are drawn to a method for measuring an analyte in blood, classified in class 435, subclass 7.4.
- V. Claims 41-53 are drawn to an immunosensor system for blood comprising an immunosensor comprising a first and second immobilized antibody, classified in class 435, subclass 287.2.
- VI. Claims 54-56 are drawn to an immunoassay device comprising a bulk conductivity sensor, classified in class 435, subclass 285.2.
- VII. Claims 57-64 are drawn to a method of performing an immunoassay for an analyte in blood and correcting for the hematocrit of the sample, classified in class 436, subclass 525.
- VIII. Claims 65-68 are drawn to an amperometric immunosensor, classified in class 422, subclass 82.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

1. Inventions of each of groups I, III, V, VI and VIII are directed to related products.

The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e.,

are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the products are mutually exclusive, are not obvious variants and have materially different design because each of the products requires product limitations that are not required of the other products. The product of group I requires a first immunosensor, which is not required by the product of groups III, VI or VIII, and a second immunosensor, which is not required by the product of group V. The product of group III requires providing a conduit, which is not required of the product of group I, V or VIII, and a means for treating the sample sufficient to increase the ionic strength of the sample, which is not required of product VI. The product of group V requires a second immobilized antibody covering at least a portion of an immunosensor comprising a first antibody, which is not required of the products of groups I, III, VI or VIII. The product of group VI requires a bulk conductivity sensor, which is not required of the product of group I, III, V or III. The product of group VIII requires a porous polyvinyl alcohol layer, which is not required of the product of group I, III, V or VI.

2. Inventions of each of groups II, IV and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the processes are mutually exclusive, are not obvious variants and have materially different design because each of the processes requires method steps that are not required of the other processes. The process of group II requires contacting a sample with an immunosensor system, which is not required of the process of group IV, and washing a first

Art Unit: 1641

and second immunosensor, which is not required of the process of group VII. The process of group IV requires adding a salt reagent to a whole-blood sample, which is not required of the process of group II or VII. The process of group VII requires contacting a blood sample with a bulk conductivity sensor, which is not required of the process of group II or IV.

3. Inventions of a) each of groups I, III, V, VI and VIII and b) each of groups II, IV and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case each of the products of groups I, III, V, VI and VIII can be used in any of the materially different processes of groups II, IV and VII.

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. §821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. § 804.01.

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic. If any of groups I, II or V is elected, ONE species from species each of groups A and B must also be elected.

Group A is drawn to a first and second immunosensor selected from: electrochemical, amperometric, potentiometric, field effect transistor, conductimetric, optical, evanescent wave, optical wave, thermometric, or acoustic wave sensors.

Group B is drawn to a second immobilized antibody selected from: plasma protein, HSA, BSA, fibrinogen and IgG fc region.

Art Unit: 1641

Each of the immunosensors of group A are patentably distinct because they require different detection methods and detect different properties. Each of the antibodies of group B are different because they require different biological structure and bind to different antigens.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Art Unit: 1641

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

2. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Yu whose telephone number is (571) 272-2933. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571) 272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Melanie Yu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641


LONG V. LE 06/09/06
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600